

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,)
) Case No. 1:25-cv-18
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,)
)
 Defendant.)

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,)
) Case No. 1:25-cv-19
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 JOE BIDEN, *et al.,*)
)
 Defendants.)

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,)
) Case No. 1:25-cv-20
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 FEDERAL AVIATION)
 ADMINISTRATION,)
)
 Defendant.)

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-21

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,

Plaintiff,

v.

PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES
LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-34

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,

Plaintiff,

v.

BILL LEE, Governor

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-35

CHARLES MICHAEL ROSS,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, *et al.*,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-36

ORDER

On February 2, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Dumitru entered a report and recommendation, recommending that: (1) the above-captioned cases be dismissed and closed; (2) Plaintiff Charles Michael Ross's motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* in each of these cases be denied as moot; and (3) the Court enter a permanent injunction made retroactive to February 2, 2025, such that any lawsuits Ross between February 2, 2025 and the entry of the permanent injunction are subject to being summarily dismissed and closed upon entry of the permanent injunction.¹ On February 7, 2025, the Court permanently enjoined Ross from making further filings without court approval based on his history of frivolous filings. Nonetheless, between the time Magistrate Judge Dumitru entered his report and recommendation and the time the Court entered its permanent injunction, Ross attempted to initiate two additional cases. *See Ross v. Hamilton County Government*, Case No. 1:25-mc-8 and *Ross v. Midland Credit Management, et al.* Case No. 1:25-cv-9. These cases appear to suffer the same defects identified in the above-captioned cases and continues Ross's pattern of filing frivolous lawsuits.

Ross has not objected to Magistrate Judge Dumitru's report and recommendation, and the deadline for doing so has now passed. The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Dumitru's report and recommendation, as well as the records in the above-caption cases, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Dumitru's well-reasoned conclusions. Accordingly:

¹ Magistrate Judge Dumitru also recommended that Ross be permanently enjoined from making further filings without obtaining prior court approval, which the Court did on February 7, 2025. Accordingly, the Court need not address this recommendation in accepting and adopting Magistrate Judge Dumitru's report and recommendation.

- The Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Dumitru's report and recommendation;
- The above-captioned cases are **DISMISSED**, and the Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **CLOSE** these cases;
- Ross's motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the above-captioned cases are **DENIED AS MOOT**;

Additionally, because Ross's allegations in *Ross v. Hamilton County Government*, Case No. 1:25-mc-8 and *Ross v. Midland Credit Management, et al.* Case No. 1:25-cv-9 also appear frivolous, to the extent he intends to continue pursuing his claims in these cases, Ross is hereby **ORDERED** to comply with the requirements set forth in the Court's February 7, 2025 permanent filing injunction on or before **March 21, 2025**. Failure to comply with the requirements set forth in this order and the Court's February 7, 2025 permanent filing injunction will result in these actions being dismissed for failure to prosecute under Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Travis R. McDonough

TRAVIS R. MCDONOUGH
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE